

**SUMMARY REPORT OF INVESTIGATION<sup>1</sup>****I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Date of Incident:	July 18, 2017; May 2017 – October 29, 2018
Time of Incident:	Ongoing
Location of Incident:	[REDACTED] Electronic Means
Date of COPA Notification:	June 4, 2018
Time of COPA Notification:	9:49 p.m.

Complainant [REDACTED] alleges that between May 2017 and October 29, 2018, Officer [REDACTED] sent her numerous unwanted messages via electronic means. [REDACTED] further alleges that Officer [REDACTED] made unwanted sexual advances towards her via electronic means. After an initial investigation, The Civilian Office of Police Accountability (“COPA”) also alleges that on July 18, 2017, Officer [REDACTED] and Officer [REDACTED] [REDACTED] were outside of their district when they made a personal visit to [REDACTED] home located at [REDACTED] while on duty. After a thorough investigation the COPA recommends the allegations be Unfounded.

**II. INVOLVED PARTIES**

Involved Officer #1:	[REDACTED], Star [REDACTED], Employee ID [REDACTED], Date of Appointment: [REDACTED], Rank: Police Officer, Unit of Assignment: [REDACTED] District, DOB: [REDACTED] Male, African American.
Involved Officer #2:	[REDACTED], Star [REDACTED] Employee ID [REDACTED] Date of Appointment: [REDACTED] Rank: Police Officer, Unit of Assignment: [REDACTED] District, DOB: [REDACTED], Male, African American.
Involved Individual #1:	[REDACTED], DOB: [REDACTED] Female, African American

<sup>1</sup> On September 15, 2017, the Civilian Office of Police Accountability (COPA) replaced the Independent Police Review Authority (IPRA) as the civilian oversight agency of the Chicago Police Department. Therefore, this investigation, which began under IPRA, was transferred to COPA on September 15, 2017, and the recommendation(s) set forth herein are the recommendation(s) of COPA.

### III. ALLEGATIONS

Officer	Allegation	Finding
Officer [REDACTED]	<p>1. It is alleged by [REDACTED] that Officer [REDACTED] sent numerous unwanted messages to her via electronic means during the time period of May 2017 to October 29, 2018 in violation of Rule 1.</p> <p>2. It is alleged by [REDACTED] that Officer [REDACTED] made unwanted sexual advances via electronic means during the time period of May 2017 to October 29, 2018 in violation of Rule 1.</p> <p>3. It is alleged by COPA that on July 18, 2017, while on duty, Officer [REDACTED] was outside of his district when he made a visit to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] in violation of Rule 30.</p>	Unfounded
Officer [REDACTED]	1. It is alleged by COPA that on July 18, 2017, while on duty, Officer [REDACTED] was outside of his district when he made a visit to [REDACTED] [REDACTED] in violation of Rule 30.	Unfounded

### IV. APPLICABLE RULES AND LAWS

---

#### Rules

**Rule 1:** Violation of any law or ordinance.

**Rule 30:** Leaving duty assignment without being properly relieved or without proper authorization.

---

#### State Laws

**720 ILCS 5/26.5-3 - Harassment Through Electronic Communications**

### V. INVESTIGATION<sup>2</sup>

#### a. Interviews

COPA conducted complainant [REDACTED] audio statement on August 14, 2018.<sup>3</sup> [REDACTED] stated that she met Officer [REDACTED] in 2017 while she worked for the [REDACTED] located at [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that Officer [REDACTED] worked at [REDACTED]

---

<sup>2</sup> COPA conducted a thorough and complete investigation. The following is a summary of the material evidence gathered and relied upon in our analysis.

as a security guard. [REDACTED] stated that in May of 2017 at [REDACTED], Officer [REDACTED] joined in on a conversation she was having with a co-worker about an upcoming vacation. [REDACTED] stated that Officer [REDACTED] offered her money to get her hair done and asked her for her telephone number. [REDACTED] stated that was the first time Officer [REDACTED] offered her money. [REDACTED] stated Officer [REDACTED] texted her within the next two days and gave her \$120.00. [REDACTED] stated that the next time Officer [REDACTED] called her was on Mother's Day 2017. [REDACTED] stated she met Officer [REDACTED] in the parking lot of [REDACTED] where he gave her \$100.00.

[REDACTED] stated that after Mother's Day 2017, Officer [REDACTED] began to constantly text and call her. [REDACTED] stated that during the summer of 2017, Officer [REDACTED] wife called her and questioned her about Officer [REDACTED] giving her money. [REDACTED] stated Officer [REDACTED] denied having a wife and continued to text and call her insisting to see her. [REDACTED] stated she never hugged, kissed, or dated Officer [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that she became fearful of Officer [REDACTED] when he made a visit to her home while on duty. [REDACTED] stated she was with her cousin, [REDACTED] [REDACTED] when Officer [REDACTED] called her to meet him outside. [REDACTED] stated she saw Officer [REDACTED] in a Chicago Police Department squad car with his partner. [REDACTED] stated she took a picture of [REDACTED] in his squad car, however, she no longer had the picture. [REDACTED] stated she asked Officer [REDACTED] how he obtained her address. [REDACTED] stated Officer [REDACTED] didn't answer her but stated he was in the area to get his shoes polished. [REDACTED] stated she told Officer [REDACTED] to leave her alone and she blocked him from her phone. [REDACTED] stated she was afraid Officer [REDACTED] used his resources as a Chicago Police Officer to find her personal information. [REDACTED] stated Officer [REDACTED] no longer worked at the [REDACTED] on [REDACTED] in 2018 but has come to the store to see her.

[REDACTED] stated that Officer [REDACTED] still communicates with her via Facebook messenger requesting from her a call, text, or date. [REDACTED] stated Officer [REDACTED] made unwanted sexual advances towards her and stated that if he gave, he expected to receive. [REDACTED] stated that she told Officer [REDACTED] on multiple occasions to leave her alone. [REDACTED] stated that Officer [REDACTED] has never stopped contacting her and on one occasion called her 200 times in one day. [REDACTED] stated she is terrified of Officer [REDACTED] and fears for her life. [REDACTED] further stated she did meet with Officer [REDACTED] on another occasion at a park district to collect \$40.00. [REDACTED] stated that Officer [REDACTED] continued to call her, and she warned him she would call 911 and report him if he did not cease contacting her. [REDACTED] stated she called 311 and was told she could not file a police report and was instructed to call COPA. [REDACTED] stated she also told her friend, Chicago Police Officer [REDACTED] about Officer [REDACTED] and she advised her to stop taking money from him and that if she did not do anything about the situation, Officer [REDACTED] would not stop. [REDACTED] stated that Officer [REDACTED] has apologized to her for coming to her house and stalking her. [REDACTED] stated that Officer [REDACTED] can't help himself from stalking her and calling her.

COPA conducted witness [REDACTED] audio statement on October 1, 2018.<sup>4</sup> [REDACTED] stated she was at [REDACTED] home on July 17<sup>th</sup> or 18<sup>th</sup> of 2017.<sup>5</sup> [REDACTED] stated that she and [REDACTED] were in [REDACTED] car leaving to the mall when [REDACTED] noticed a police vehicle. [REDACTED]

<sup>3</sup> Attachment 7

<sup>4</sup> Attachment 24

<sup>5</sup> COPA reviewed the GPS record for Officer [REDACTED] squad car, [REDACTED], for July 17, 2017 and did not find that it stopped at or around [REDACTED]. See Attachment 60.

stated [REDACTED] either made a phone call or received a phone call from Officer [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] made a comment to her about it being Officer [REDACTED] the officer who had been coming to her home. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] also commented that she never told Officer [REDACTED] where she lived. [REDACTED] stated that after [REDACTED] realized it was Officer [REDACTED], she parked her car behind the police vehicle. [REDACTED] stated [REDACTED] exited her car and approached the police vehicle. [REDACTED] stated [REDACTED] questioned Officer [REDACTED] about him being at her home and how he obtained her address. [REDACTED] further stated that she informed [REDACTED] that Officer [REDACTED] might be outside of his district. [REDACTED] stated she remained in the vehicle while [REDACTED] was speaking to Officer [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated she could hear the conversation between [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] because the car window was down. [REDACTED] stated [REDACTED] asked her to take pictures of the squad car which she did but no longer has. [REDACTED] stated the interaction between [REDACTED] and Officer [REDACTED] did not last long. [REDACTED] stated she did not know if Officer [REDACTED] had been to [REDACTED] home prior to that day. [REDACTED] stated she did recall [REDACTED] speaking to her about Officer [REDACTED] calls and text messages but did not know specifically what they were about. [REDACTED] stated that prior to July 17<sup>th</sup> or 18<sup>th</sup>, [REDACTED] had not mentioned Officer [REDACTED] to her. [REDACTED] stated that she and [REDACTED] were close cousins. [REDACTED] stated that while [REDACTED] seemed scared of Officer [REDACTED] on the 17<sup>th</sup> or 18<sup>th</sup> of July, [REDACTED] had not previously seen [REDACTED] scared while speaking of Officer [REDACTED].

COPA conducted witness Officer [REDACTED] audio statement on September 20, 2018.<sup>6</sup> Officer [REDACTED] stated that in 2017 she worked as a security officer for the [REDACTED] located on [REDACTED]. Officer [REDACTED] stated she met [REDACTED] at [REDACTED]. Officer [REDACTED] stated she has known [REDACTED] since May of 2017. Officer [REDACTED] stated she considered [REDACTED] an acquaintance. Officer [REDACTED] stated she also met Officer [REDACTED] while she worked at [REDACTED]. Officer [REDACTED] stated Officer [REDACTED] was also a security officer for [REDACTED]. Officer [REDACTED] stated she was aware Officer [REDACTED] was a Chicago Police Officer. Officer [REDACTED] stated she has never worked with Officer [REDACTED] within the Chicago Police Department. Officer [REDACTED] stated [REDACTED] told her Officer [REDACTED] was stalking her. Officer [REDACTED] further stated [REDACTED] told her Officer [REDACTED] sent her inappropriate text messages. Officer [REDACTED] stated Officer [REDACTED] never told her anything about [REDACTED]. Officer [REDACTED] stated that to her knowledge Officer [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were not in a relationship. Officer [REDACTED] stated she did not know why Officer [REDACTED] called or text messaged [REDACTED]. Officer [REDACTED] stated she did not recall seeing Officer [REDACTED] or [REDACTED] interacting in person. Officer [REDACTED] stated [REDACTED] talked to her about Officer [REDACTED] at [REDACTED]. Officer [REDACTED] stated that she specifically recalled [REDACTED] telling her Officer [REDACTED] gave her money for Mother's Day. Officer [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] also told her that she saw Officer [REDACTED] outside of her home. Officer [REDACTED] stated she did not recall the date [REDACTED] said Officer [REDACTED] was at her home.

COPA conducted accused Officer [REDACTED] audio statement on November 13, 2018.<sup>7</sup> Officer [REDACTED] stated that on July 18, 2017, he was off on his regular day off. Officer [REDACTED] stated that he was working in the [REDACTED] District during the month of July 2017. Officer [REDACTED] stated that in the [REDACTED] District officers work 10-hour shifts, and July 18, 2017 was his first day off for the week. Officer [REDACTED] stated that on July 18,

<sup>6</sup> Attachment 25

<sup>7</sup> Attachment 32

2017, he was not in a police vehicle near the location of [REDACTED]. Officer [REDACTED] stated that during the month of July 18, 2017, his assigned partner was Officer [REDACTED]. Officer [REDACTED] stated that Officer [REDACTED] has been his partner for the past four or five years. Officer [REDACTED] stated Officer [REDACTED] has never spoken to him about [REDACTED]. After being shown the picture of [REDACTED], Officer [REDACTED] stated he has never seen [REDACTED]. Officer [REDACTED] stated that on July 18, 2017, Officer [REDACTED] did not ask him to accompany him in making a personal visit to [REDACTED] while on duty.

COPA conducted accused Officer [REDACTED] audio statement on November 13, 2018.<sup>8</sup> Officer [REDACTED] stated that in May of 2017, he worked as a security officer for [REDACTED] and was employed by the [REDACTED] located at [REDACTED]. Officer [REDACTED] stated that in 2018 he was relocated to the [REDACTED] located at [REDACTED] because the agency lost the contract with the [REDACTED] location. Officer [REDACTED] stated his employment with [REDACTED] was a part-time job and separate from his duties within the Chicago Police Department. Officer [REDACTED] stated he met [REDACTED] while working at [REDACTED]. Officer [REDACTED] stated that he and [REDACTED] are friends. Officer [REDACTED] stated he never went on dates or had any physical contact with [REDACTED].

Officer [REDACTED] stated that the telephone number [REDACTED] has been his telephone number since May of 2017. Officer [REDACTED] stated that sometime after May of 2017, he and [REDACTED] mutually exchanged telephone numbers. Officer [REDACTED] stated that he began communicating with [REDACTED] almost daily via electronic means shortly after exchanging telephone numbers. Officer [REDACTED] stated [REDACTED] telephone number synced to his Facebook Messenger Application and he would also communicate with her via that application. Officer [REDACTED] stated that he and [REDACTED] had private adult conversations via electronic means. Officer [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] did tell him one time to stop communicating with her. Officer [REDACTED] stated that after that time, he and [REDACTED] did stop communicating but the communication started again after [REDACTED] called him from a telephone number that he did not recognize as hers.

Officer [REDACTED] stated that when [REDACTED] called him she asked him to send her money through a telephone cash application. Officer [REDACTED] stated he previously gave [REDACTED] money two or three times. Officer [REDACTED] stated that while he previously gave money to [REDACTED], he felt uncomfortable sending her money via a telephone application. Officer [REDACTED] stated that when he met [REDACTED], they were friends and he gave her cash gifts because he knew she had a daughter. Officer [REDACTED] stated that as time went on, [REDACTED] asked for more and more money. Officer [REDACTED] stated that he stopped giving [REDACTED] money because he no longer felt comfortable doing so. Officer [REDACTED] stated that he did make sexual advances towards [REDACTED] because she asked for monetary gifts. Officer [REDACTED] stated he did not recall whether [REDACTED] asked him to stop making sexual advances towards her. Officer [REDACTED] stated he never became aware of his sexual advances being unwanted by [REDACTED] because she would reciprocate. Officer [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] did tell him to stop communicating with her or she would report him. Officer [REDACTED] stated he was alarmed when [REDACTED] made that statement. Officer [REDACTED] stated he stopped communicating with [REDACTED] however, [REDACTED] again called him using an unknown telephone number and began talking to him again.

---

<sup>8</sup> Attachment 49-53

Upon being shown the text messages provided by [REDACTED] in which she specifically tells Officer [REDACTED] to leave her alone, Officer [REDACTED] stated [REDACTED] was saying crazy stuff in that message. Officer [REDACTED] stated that while on duty he has encountered situations in which one person no longer wishes to have communication with another and he has advised the individuals to stay away from each other. Officer [REDACTED] stated that while [REDACTED] told him to leave her alone, he continued to talk to her because she would call him. Officer [REDACTED] stated that he also texted [REDACTED] to leave him alone and she continued to reach out to him. After being asked about a text in which Officer [REDACTED] apologized and asked for [REDACTED] forgiveness, Officer [REDACTED] stated he was apologizing for reaching out to her and having misunderstandings. Officer [REDACTED] stated that before that message, he saw [REDACTED] at [REDACTED] and had a friendly conversation with her in person and then via telephone. Officer [REDACTED] stated that while his messages from August 2018 to October 29, 2018 went unanswered by [REDACTED] via message, she did call him on the telephone to talk. Officer [REDACTED] stated that during one of the phone calls he asked [REDACTED] why she was calling him if she had told him to leave her alone. Officer [REDACTED] stated [REDACTED] responded that is how she is and that is what she does. Officer [REDACTED] stated that he has not spoken to [REDACTED] since he received the COPA allegations. Officer [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] has also not called him since the COPA allegations. Officer [REDACTED] further stated that on July 18, 2017, he did not make a personal visit to [REDACTED] while on duty because he was off duty on his regular day off. Officer [REDACTED] stated that he recognized he made a bad choice in continuing to contact [REDACTED]. Officer [REDACTED] stated he believed [REDACTED] change in behavior towards him was a result of him denying her substantial amounts of money. Officer [REDACTED] stated he has no intention to ever contact [REDACTED] again.

#### b. Digital Evidence

**Text Message Photographs** provided by [REDACTED] indicate that there were continuous messages from Officer [REDACTED] to [REDACTED] between the dates of December 1, 2017 and October 29, 2017. The text messages indicate that Officer [REDACTED] repetitively attempted to persuade [REDACTED] on a date by offering gifts and sexual favors.<sup>9</sup>

A **Photograph** provided by Officer [REDACTED] sent to him by [REDACTED] depicts a provocative image of [REDACTED].<sup>10</sup>

#### c. Documentary Evidence

**Attendance and Assignment Sheets** indicate that July 18, 2017, was a regular day off for Officers [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] and they were not on duty.<sup>11</sup>

**GPS Records** indicate no search results for vehicle number 9063 on July 18, 2017, near the location of [REDACTED].<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Attachments 10,11,12,13,14,15,30,40. Total of 150 pages of text messages.

<sup>10</sup> Attachment 48

<sup>11</sup> Attachments 44-45

<sup>12</sup> Attachments 55, 56

**GPS Records** indicate that on July 17, 2017, vehicle number [REDACTED] was traveling at 5 mph at or near [REDACTED] at 7:42 pm and 11 mph at or near [REDACTED] at 7:43 pm. The GPS Records do not show the vehicle stopping at or near [REDACTED].<sup>13</sup>

## VI. ANALYSIS

The burden of proof COPA uses in its analysis is the preponderance of the evidence standard. It is alleged by [REDACTED] that Officer [REDACTED] sent her numerous unwanted messages via electronic means. [REDACTED] further alleged that Officer [REDACTED] made unwanted sexual advances towards her via electronic means. COPA also alleged that on July 18, 2017, Officer [REDACTED] and Officer [REDACTED] were outside of their district when they made a personal visit to [REDACTED] home while on duty. After analyzing the evidence, COPA determined the allegations were not based on the facts revealed through the investigation.

COPA's investigation revealed that [REDACTED] voluntarily provided Officer [REDACTED] with her telephone number to make arrangements to receive money from Officer [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] stated that throughout 2017, she continued to communicate with Officer [REDACTED] via electronic means and received at least three monetary gifts from Officer [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] allegation that Officer [REDACTED] sent her unwanted messages via electronic means is refuted by her own statement. Moreover, while [REDACTED] messages to Officer [REDACTED] show that she asked him to stop messaging her, the messages appear incomplete in that on more than one instance Officer [REDACTED] messages seem to be responses.<sup>14</sup> It is plausible to infer that [REDACTED] deleted her messages to Officer [REDACTED] prior to providing them to COPA. Additionally, Officer [REDACTED] stated that some of his messages were in response to telephone conversations with [REDACTED] calls that were initiated by [REDACTED]. Officer [REDACTED] also stated that although he ceased communication with [REDACTED] when she requested him to do so, the communication would recommence after [REDACTED] telephone calls. Furthermore, Officer [REDACTED] statement and text messages confirm that he was making sexual advances towards [REDACTED]. Officer [REDACTED] however, stated that [REDACTED] reciprocated the sexual advances. This is supported by the provocative photograph sent from [REDACTED] to Officer [REDACTED] in 2018.<sup>15</sup> These actions are contrary to [REDACTED] allegations of the advances being unwanted.

Although [REDACTED] allegations seemed substantial at the onset, an analysis of all the evidence indicates that Officer [REDACTED] initial messages and gifts were the beginning of a courtship. While [REDACTED] may not have been romantically interested in Officer [REDACTED] she did take advantage of the situation for personal financial gain. As time progressed, whether it was Officer [REDACTED] refusal to provide [REDACTED] with substantial amounts of money or something else, [REDACTED] made it known to Officer [REDACTED] that she no longer wished to communicate with him and made a record by saving the text messages. Despite these messages, however, [REDACTED] telephone calls and photograph(s) indicated the contrary to Officer [REDACTED]. Officer [REDACTED] persistence in his messages to [REDACTED] displayed an extreme infatuation with her. Officer [REDACTED] admits that he made a mistake in continuing to pursue [REDACTED] despite her requests. Officer [REDACTED] stated he has no intention of ever communicating with [REDACTED] again and he has not received any more calls

<sup>13</sup> Attachment 60.

<sup>14</sup> See generally, Attachments 10,11,12,13,14,15,30,40.

<sup>15</sup> Attachment 49

from [REDACTED].<sup>16</sup> For the aforementioned reasons, COPA recommends the finding of Unfounded for Allegations 1 and 2.

COPA also recommends the allegations that Officers [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were outside of their district while on duty on July 18, 2017, be unfounded since documentary evidence shows they were both off duty on their regular day off.<sup>17</sup>

## VII. CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis set forth above, COPA makes the following findings:

Officer	Allegation	Finding
Officer [REDACTED]	<p>1. It is alleged by [REDACTED] that Officer [REDACTED] sent numerous unwanted messages to her via electronic means during the time period of May 2017 to October 29, 2018 in violation of Rule 1.</p> <p>2. It is alleged by [REDACTED] that Officer [REDACTED] made unwanted sexual advances via electronic means during the time period of May 2017 to October 29, 2018 in violation of Rule 1.</p> <p>3. It is alleged by COPA that on July 18, 2017, while on duty, Officer [REDACTED] was outside of his district when he made a visit to [REDACTED] in violation of Rule 30.</p>	Unfounded
Officer [REDACTED]	<p>1. It is alleged by COPA that on July 18, 2017, while on duty, Officer [REDACTED] was outside of his district when he made a visit to [REDACTED] in violation of Rule 30.</p>	Unfounded

Approved:

[REDACTED]  
Deputy Chief Administrator – Chief Investigator

Date

<sup>16</sup> Per a conversation with [REDACTED] on November 8, 2018, since being served with the allegations, Officer [REDACTED] has not communicated with [REDACTED] through any means.

<sup>17</sup> [REDACTED] stated she recalled the date of the alleged incident as being July 18, 2017 because she posted a photograph to Facebook with [REDACTED] at the mall on that date.

**Appendix A**

Assigned Investigative Staff

<b>Squad#:</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Investigator:</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Supervising Investigator:</b>	[REDACTED]
<b>Deputy Chief Administrator:</b>	[REDACTED]